



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/864,547	05/24/2001	Jason Yi Blakely	RSW920010005US1	4085
46270 7590 01/10/2008 IBM CORPORATION (SYL-RSW) C/O SYNNESTVEDT & LECHNER LLP 1101 MARKET STREET, SUITE 2600 PHILADELPHIA, PA 19107			EXAMINER KE, PENG	
			ART UNIT 2174	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 01/10/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**MAILED**

**JAN 10 2008**

**Technology Center 2100**

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 09/864,547  
Filing Date: May 24, 2001  
Appellant(s): BLAKELY ET AL.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Jason Yi Blakely and Robert S. Sielken  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 10/02/06 appealing from the Office action mailed 5/18/06.

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

**(7) Claims Appendix**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

20010051959	Penn	12-2001
6,141,007	Lebling	10-2000

**(9) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 13-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Penn et al. US Publication 2001/0051959.

As per claim 13, Penn teaches graphical user interface (GUI) comprising:

a first display area for displaying data from a first set of information in accordance with properties of a first locale designation; (paragraph 0014) and

a second display area for displaying data from a second set of information in accordance with properties of a second locale designation. (paragraph 0014)

As per claim 14, which dependent on claim 13. Penn teaches the GUI of claim 13. Penn further teaches wherein said first and second locale designations are different. (paragraph 0037)

As per claim 15, which dependent on claim 14. Penn teaches the GUI of claim 14. Penn further teaches wherein said first locale designation is a system locale designation. (paragraph 0037)

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 16, which dependent on claim 13. Penn teaches the GUI of claim 13. Penn further teaches wherein the data from said first set of information displayed in said first display area is sorted in accordance with properties of said first locale designation; (paragraph 0014) and the data from said second set of information displayed in said second display area is sorted according in accordance with properties of said second locale designation. (paragraph 0014)

As per claim 17, which dependent on claim 13. Penn teaches the GUI of claim 13. Penn further teaches comprising: a third display area for displaying data from a third set of information, said third set of information associated with a third locale designation. (paragraph 0014)

As per claim 18, which dependent on claim 17. Penn teaches the GUI of claim 17. Penn further teaches wherein said first, second, and third locale designations are different. (paragraph 0014)

As per claim 19, which dependent on claim 17. Penn teaches the GUI of claim 17. Penn wherein said first locale designation is a system locale designation, (figure 2) said second locale designation is a source locale designation, and said third locale designation is a target locale designation. (paragraph 0014)

As per claim 20, which dependent on claim 17. Penn teaches the GUI of claim 17. Penn teaches wherein said system locale designation, (figure 2)

said source locale designation, and said target form part of a translation system interface. (paragraph 0014)

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 21, which dependent on claim 17. Penn teaches the GUI of claim 17. Penn further teaches wherein said first locale designation is associated with at least a first character set, said second locale designation is associated with at least a second character set, and said third locale designation is associated with at least a third character set. (paragraph 0014)

As per claim 22, which dependent on claim 17. Penn teaches the GUI of claim 17. Penn further teaches wherein the data from said first set of information displayed in said first display area is sorted in accordance with properties of said first locale designation, (paragraph 0014)

the data from said second set of information displayed in said second display area is sorted in accordance with properties of said second locale designation, (paragraph 0014) and

the data from said third set of information displayed in said third display area is sorted in accordance with properties of said third locale designation. (paragraph 0014)

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-12, and 23-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Penn et al. US Publication 2001/0051959 in view of Lebling et al. US Patent 6,141,007.

As per claim 1, Penn et al teaches a method for displaying information in a display area comprising:

Art Unit: 2174

the steps of: associating a first set of information with a first locale designation;  
(paragraph 0014)

associating a second set of information with a second locale designation; displaying data from said first set of information in accordance with properties of said first locale designation;  
(paragraph 0014; Since there are multiple counties on the website, there is a second set of information) and

However Penn et al. fails to teach displaying data from said second set of information in accordance with properties of said second locale designation, said data from said first and second set of information displayed simultaneously on the display area.

Lebling et al. teaches displaying multiple workspaces simultaneously. (figures 5A-5b)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Lebling's teaching with method of Penn et al. in order to users to view multiple web-pages simultaneously.

As per claim 2, Penn and Lebling teach the method of claim 1. Penn further teaches the method comprises the steps of: sorting said first set of information in accordance with properties of said first locale designation; (paragraph 0014) and

sorting said second set of information in accordance with properties of said second locale designation. (paragraph 0014)

As per claim 3, Penn and Lebling teach the method of claim 2. Penn further teaches wherein said first set of information is searchable in accordance with properties of said first locale designation and said second set of information is searchable in accordance with properties of said second locale designation. (paragraphs 0046-0051)

As per claim 4, Penn and Lebling teach the method of claim 1. Penn further teaches wherein said step of displaying data from said first set of information comprises displaying data from said first set of information in a character set associated with said first locale designation; (figure 3A, paragraph 0106-0107) and

said step of displaying data from said second set of information comprises displaying data from said second set of information in a character set associated with said second locale designation. (paragraph 0014)

As per claim 5, Penn and Lebling teach the method of claim 1. Penn further teaches wherein said first locale designation and said second locale designation are different. (paragraph 0014)

As per claim 6, Penn and Lebling teach the method of claim 2. Penn further teaches wherein said first locale designation is a system locale designation. (figure 2. Item Language)

As per claim 7, Penn and Lebling teach the method of claim 1. Penn further teaches the method comprising the step of:

displaying data from a third set of information associated with a third locale designation. (paragraph 0014) and

Lebling further teaches said data from said third set of information displayed simultaneously with said first and second set of data on the display area. (Fig 5a)

As per claim 8, Penn and Lebling teach the method of claim 7. Penn further teaches the method comprising the steps of:

Art Unit: 2174

sorting said first set of information in accordance with properties of said first locale designation; (paragraphs 0046-0051)

sorting said second set of information in accordance with properties of said second locale designation; (paragraphs 0046-0051) and

sorting said third set of information in accordance with properties of said third locale designation. (paragraphs 0046-0051)

As per claim 9, Penn and Lebling teach the method of claim 8. Penn further teaches wherein said first set of information is searchable in accordance with properties of said first locale designation, (figure 3A, paragraph 0106-0107)

said second set of information is searchable in accordance with properties of said second locale designation, (figure 3A, paragraph 0106-0107) and

said third set of information is searchable in accordance with properties of said third locale designation. (figure 3A, paragraph 0106-0107)

As per claim 10, Penn and Lebling teach the method of claim 7. Penn further teaches wherein said step of

displaying data from said first set of information comprises displaying data from said first set of information in a character set associated with said first locale designation; (figure 3A, paragraph 0106-0107)

said step of displaying data from said second set of information comprises displaying data from said second set of information in a character set associated with said second locale designation; and (figure 3A, paragraph 0106-0107)

Art Unit: 2174

said step of displaying data from said thirdset of information comprises displaying data from said third set of information in a character set associated with said third locale designation. (figure 3A, paragraph 0106-0107)

As per claim 11, it is of the same rationale as claim 6. Supra.

As per claim 12, Penn and Lebling teach the method of claim 7. Penn teaches wherein said first, second, and third locale designations are different. (paragraph 0014)

As per claims 23 and 24, they are rejected with the same rationale as claims 1 and 2. Supra.

As per claims 25-28, they are the system claims of claims 1, 2, and 7-9 and are therefore rejected on the same basis.

As per claim 29-32, they are the computer program product claims of claims 1, 2, and 7-9 and are therefore rejected on the same basis.

#### **(10) Response to Argument**

Appellant's argument regarding claim 1:

Appellant argued that examiner has not established a prima facie case for claim 1.

Examiner disagrees. Penn and Lebling teach the limitation of claim 1. Pen teaches associating information with locale designation. (see Penn, paragraph 0014) In Penn. users can select a nation from the main web page, (see Penn, Figure 2) and they will receive a tremendous

Art Unit: 2174

amount of information regarding the target designation. (see Penn, paragraph 0014) This information includes: weather in country's major cities, time in country, currency converter, facts on country, maps of the country, and even a translator for the particular country. (see Penn, paragraph 0014) Furthermore, in each country's web page, the text is in both English and the language in that particular country. (see Penn, paragraph 0106) Therefore, examiner believes the prima facie case for this limitation is met.

While Penn did not teach simultaneously displaying two web pages of two different countries, Lebling teaches this limitation. In Lebling, the user can open up two separate windows and display them at the same time. (see Lebling; figure 5B, items 31 A, 31 B; figure 6A items 31A, 31B, figure 6B, items 31A, 31B) Furthermore, Lebling suggested that it would be obvious for one of the ordinary skills in the art to do so because it saves users from switching back and forth between windows and making errors in between. (see Lebling, column 1, lines 35-40) Here, the web page of Pen is implemented for web browsing windows (see Penn, paragraph 0032, internet navigation tool is a web browser) and users often open up multiple windows at the same time. Therefore, it is obvious to combine Lebling's teaching with method of Penn.

In appellant's arguments, appellant seems to suggest that more should be read into the limitation, "information associated with locale," (see page 9 of Appellant's brief) and its real meaning is the language of the country. However, in the limitation of the claim 1, the word "language" was never mentioned. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Finally, even if the limitation recites

Art Unit: 2174

“language associated with locale,” Penn teaches this limitation because the text of web page is displayed in both the language of that country and English. (see Penn, paragraph 0106)

Penn and Lebling teach the limitation of claim 1 and there is a motivation that is obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art to combine the two. Therefore the rejection for claim 1 should be affirmed.

Appellant’s argument regarding claim 13:

Appellant’s argument to claim 13 is similar to claim 1. Furthermore, appellant seems to imply that claim 13 also recited a similar limitation of claim 1, “said data from said first and second set of information display simultaneously on the display area.” (see page 8 of Appellant’s brief) However, this limitation is not recited in the language of claim 13. Therefore, the 102(e) rejection of claim 13 should be affirmed.

**(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix**

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner’s answer.


For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Peng Ke



Conferees:



**DAVID WILEY**  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100



**STEPHEN HONG**  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER